



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,271	11/28/2001	Amit Chakraborty	2000P09096 US01	2366

7590 04/06/2004
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

9

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/996,271	CHAKRABORTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-13 and 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-6, 8-13, and 15-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on January 26, 2004 has been received and entered. Claims 2, 7, and 14 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, and 15-28 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1).

As to claim 1, Goldberg et al. discloses a system for processing a multimedia data file to provide information supporting user navigation of multimedia data file content (See abstract, also see page figure 6), comprising:

a content parser to identify and locate previously unidentified text and image content of a data file (See page 11, paragraph 0219), the content parser applying text extraction rules to identify text and identify a document structure, wherein the document structure defines a context for identified text (See page 11, paragraphs 0218-0220).;

an image processor for processing said identified image content to identify embedded text content (See page 12, paragraphs 0236-0238) by applying object templates (See page 11, paragraph 0211);

a text sorter for parsing said identified text and said identified embedded text to locate text items in accordance with predetermined sorting rules (See page 7, paragraphs 0141-0145);
and

memory for storing a navigation file containing said text items (See page 11, paragraph 0216).

As to claim 2, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the navigation file links to at least one internal document object (See page 11, paragraphs 0213-0214).

As to claim 3, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the navigation file links to at least one external document object (See page 11, paragraph 0213).

As to claim 6, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the content parser applies pre-defined hierarchical rules for determining a level of identified text (See page 12, paragraph 0236, also see page 4, paragraph 0085, and see page 9, paragraph 0183).

As to claim 8, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the system refines a search resolution during a text identifying process to determine a location of the embedded text within an image

(See page 11, paragraphs 0213-0329, also see page 15, paragraph 0241).

As to claim 9, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein identified text comprises hyperlinks (See page 7, paragraph 0142).

As to claim 10, Goldberg et al. discloses a graphical User interface system supporting processing of a multimedia data file to provide information supporting user navigation of multimedia data file content (See page 7, paragraph 0148), comprising:

a menu generator for generating, one or more menus permitting User selection of, an input file and format to be processed (See page 5, paragraphs 00110-0115); and

an icon permitting User initiation of generation of a navigation file supporting linking of input file elements to external documents by parsing and sorting previously unidentified text and image content to identify text for incorporation in a navigation file (See page 5, paragraphs 0109-0119).

As to claim 11, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein identified text comprises hyperlinks (See page 7, paragraph 0142).

As to claim 12, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the navigation file further comprises links to at least one internal document object.

As to claim 13, Goldberg et al. discloses a method of creating an anchorable information unit in a portable document format document (See page 12, paragraph 0228), comprising the steps of:

extracting a previously unidentified text segment from the portable document format document (See page 12, paragraph 0228), the portable document format document includes one or more textual objects including one or more non-textual objects, the non-textual objects including textual segments (See page 15, paragraphs 0250-0251);

determining a context of the segment, wherein the context is selected from a context sensitive hierarchical structure (See page 4, paragraphs 0085-0093, also see page 15, paragraphs 0248- 0250); and

defining the text segment as an anchorable information unit according to the context (See page 15, paragraphs 0250-0251).

As to claim 15, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the step of determining the context further comprises the steps of:

comparing the text segment to a plurality of known patterns within the portable document format document (See pages 6-7, paragraphs 0140-0148); and

determining the context upon determining a matching the text segment and a known pattern of the portable document format document (See pages 16-17, paragraphs 0281-0282).

As to claim 17, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the portable document format document includes a known context sensitive hierarchical structure (See page 12, paragraphs 0228-0238).

As to claim 18, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the context sensitive hierarchical structure, including the anchorable information unit is searchable (See page 7, paragraphs 0143-0149).

As to claim 19, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the context includes a location for the extracted text segment (See page 19, claims 44-45 language).

As to claim 20, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the step of determining a context further comprises the step of determining a location and a style of the text segment (See page 9, paragraphs 0171-0176).

As to claim 22, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the anchorable information unit is automatically hyperlinked (See page 7, paragraph 0142).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 23, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1).

As to claim 23, Goldberg et al. discloses a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine (See page 10, paragraph 0204) to perform method steps for creating an anchorable information unit file from a portable document format document (See page 15, paragraphs 0248-0251), the method steps comprising:

parsing the portable document format document into textual portions and non-text portions (See page 11, paragraph 0219);

extracting structure from the textual portions and the non-text portions (See page 12, paragraphs 0236-0238);

determining text within textual portions, and the non-text portions (See page 11, paragraphs 0212-0214); and

hyperlinking within the textual portions and non-text portions to a related document (See page 7, paragraphs 0142-0145).

Goldberg et al. does not teach a plurality of keywords.

Jones et al. teaches a plurality of keywords (See page 9, paragraph 0090, also see page 10, claim 10 language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. to include a plurality of keywords.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. by the teaching of Jones et al. to include a plurality of keywords because it provides for faster and more accurate database storage and retrieval; this method is currently used by well-known search engines.

As to claim 25, Goldberg et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of extracting further comprises the steps of:

determining a level for extracted textual portions;

associating the context with the text; and

pattern matching extracted text to the portable document format document to determine a context and a location (See page 15, paragraphs 0241-0251, also see page 11, paragraphs 0212-0214).

As to claim 26, Goldberg et al. as modified discloses wherein the level is one of a paragraph, a heading and a subheading (See Jones et al. figure 9b).

As to claim 27, Goldberg et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of pattern matching (See page 7, paragraph 0148) further comprises the steps of:

determining a median font size for the portable document format document;

Art Unit: 2175

comparing a font size of the extracted text to the median font size for the portable document format document; and

determining a context according to font size (See page 3, paragraphs 0053-0054, also see Jones et al. page 5, paragraphs 0052-0053).

6. Claims 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1) in view of Rothermel (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035451 A1).

As to claim 16, Goldberg et al. discloses wherein the step of extracting text further comprises the step of:

extracting text form an underlying image of the portable document format document; determining a type for the image, a grayscale image, and a color image (See page 19, claim 43 language, also see page 16, paragraphs 0273-0276); and

processing the image according to the type (See page 16, paragraphs 0273-0279).

Goldberg et al. does not teach wherein the type is one of a black and white image.

Rothermel teaches wherein the type is one of a black and white image (See page 2, paragraph 0017, also see page 4, paragraph 0035).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. to include wherein the type is one of a black and white image.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. by the teaching of Rothermel to include wherein the type is one of a black and white image because it provides for user customizable image retrieval and accurate representation for stored image.

As to claim 21, Goldberg et al. does not teach further comprising the step of storing an extracted text segment in a Standard Generalized Markup Language syntax using a predefined grammar.

Rothermel teaches further comprising the step of storing an extracted text segment in a Standard Generalized Markup Language syntax using a predefined grammar (See pages 2-3, paragraphs 0019-0024).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. to include further comprising the step of storing an extracted text segment in a Standard Generalized Markup Language syntax using a predefined grammar.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Goldberg et al. by the teaching of Rothermel to include further comprising the step of storing an extracted text segment in a Standard Generalized Markup Language syntax using a predefined grammar because SGML provides less processing by maximizing limited memory and disk space by providing a complex set of “minimization” rules.

Art Unit: 2175

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1) as applied to claims 23, 25-28 and further in view of Rothermel (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035451 A1).

As to claim 24, Goldberg et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of parsing further comprises the step of differentiating color image content (See page 3, paragraph 0024).

Goldberg et al. as modified still does not teach from black-and-white content.

Rothermel teaches from black-and-white content (See page 2, paragraph 0017, also see page 4, paragraph 0035).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Goldberg et al. as modified to include from black-and-white content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Goldberg et al. as modified by the teaching of Rothermel to include from black-and-white content because it provides for user customizable image retrieval and accurate representation for stored image.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4, and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record (Goldberg et al. -U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1-and - Jones et al. -U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1-and - Rothermel (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035451 A1) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim), wherein the image processor comprises a black and white image processor comprising: a pixel smearing component reducing text to a rectangular block of pixels; and an image filtering component for cleaning a smeared image, as claimed in dependent claim 4.

The prior art of record (Goldberg et al. -U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080170 A1-and - Jones et al. -U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1-and - Rothermel (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035451 A1) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim), discloses wherein the step of hyperlinking further comprises the step of creating the anchorable information unit file, wherein the plurality of keywords are anchorable information units, as claimed in dependent claim 28.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on January 26, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument on pages 7 and 8 that "Goldberg et al. does not teach or disclose a system identifies context which is stored in an AIU" is respectfully acknowledged but it is not deemed to be persuasive.

The Examiner respectfully points to Goldberg et al. page 15, paragraphs 0244-0253 extracting content from a location identified by the AIU is clearly taught. Context is interpreted to be location within the database whereby the element is easily identified by its position relative to another.

Goldberg et al. on page 6, paragraphs 0131-0133 teaches information source and properties display indicating “the context” that the information sought is in and whether its been modified or not at its source. On page 15, paragraph 0243, Goldberg et al. teaches context filter.

Applicant’s argument that “Goldberg et al. does not extract text from both text and image objects and create a tree structure of the objects” is respectfully acknowledged but it is not deemed to be persuasive.

The Examiner respectfully points to Goldberg et al. abstract and see figure 25, 2595, shows the content database capable of “picture renderer” block 2560. On page 12, paragraphs 0236-0238, Goldberg et al. teaches parsing documents from the Web. And on page 4, paragraphs 0075 and 0085, and page 7, paragraph 0142, and page 9, paragraph 0183, Goldberg et al. shows accessing the elements in a hierarchical format.

Applicant’s argument that “Jones et al. does not teach or disclose assigning AIUs to text of a document to identify previously undefined text located in both text and non-text areas” is respectfully acknowledged

The Examiner respectfully points to the combination of Goldberg et al. with the teachings of Jones et al. wherein Goldberg et al. on page 15, paragraphs 0244-0246, Goldberg et al. teaches

the step of storing an extracted text segment in a Standard Generalized Markup Language syntax using a predefined grammar (See pages 2-3, paragraphs 0019-0024). While on page 15, paragraph 0243, Goldberg et al. teaches context filter.

Conclusion

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil
April 2, 2004


CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER